

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 332 246

CS 507 455

AUTHOR Blood, R. Warwick
TITLE Time of Voting Decision: Knowledge and Uncertainty.
PUB DATE May 91
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (41st, Chicago, IL, May 23-27, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Foreign Countries; *Mass Media; *Mass Media Use; Media Research; Political Affiliation; *Political Attitudes; Political Campaigns; *Political Influences; *Voting
IDENTIFIERS *Australia; Political Communication; *Voters; Voting Behavior

ABSTRACT

A secondary analysis of the "1987 Australian Election Study" examined differences in levels of partisanship, political interest, campaign media use, and the importance voters attach to media use, for voters who make up their minds during and before the campaign. Results suggest that voters who make their choice during the campaign are more likely to be swayed by the candidates use of the media than voters who decided before the campaign began. While undecided voters tend to use the media as a source of information about the parties, candidates, and issues, strong partisans use the media because they are interested in politics. In addition, voters who are strongly partisan and interested in politics are not only more likely to make an early choice, but to attach importance to their choice. (Nine tables of data and 11 references are included.) (PRA)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED332246

TIME OF VOTING DECISION: KNOWLEDGE AND UNCERTAINTY

R. Warwick Blood.
School of Communication & Liberal Studies
CHARLES STURT UNIVERSITY - MITCHELL
Panorama Avenue, Bathurst.
NSW. 2795. Australia.

Phone: 063 33 2521 Fax: 063 33 2409
E-Mail: wblood@bathurst.mit.chasturt.edu.au.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Warwick
Blood

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

Paper presented to the Political Communication
Division, International Communication Association,
41st Annual Conference, May 1991, Chicago. USA.

5507455

ABSTRACT

This study, a secondary analysis of the 1987 Australian Election Study, examines differences in levels of partisanship, political interest, campaign media use, and the importance voters attach to media use, for those voters who make up their minds during the campaign, and those who make up their minds before the campaign.

The data suggest that campaign deciders are more likely to attach importance to their media use in reaching a decision than precampaign deciders. Those voters who are strongly partisan and interested in politics are more likely to make early decisions about their vote and are more likely to attach importance to their vote choice. These findings support Chaffee and Choe (1980).

Preliminary evidence is also presented which extends the Becker et al. (1982) model to include time of voting decision as well as the uncertainty surrounding that decision.

Voter uncertainty appears to motivate campaign deciders to use the media and the data suggest that knowledge is related to media use. For weak partisans (those most likely to leave their decisions until later in the campaign) vote uncertainty motivates media use which increases knowledge of parties, candidates and issues. But for moderate and strong partisans (those most likely to make early decisions about their vote choice), interest motivates media use.

TIME OF VOTING DECISION: KNOWLEDGE AND UNCERTAINTY.

The time when people finally decide how they will vote in an election has long been a key variable in political communication research. Recent research has used time of voting decision to identify those voters who make up their minds during an election and who, therefore, are most likely to be susceptible to campaign specific media messages.

Related research during the 1980s has examined the link between media use and knowledge gained by voters during an election campaign, and uncertainty about vote choice.

The current study, a secondary analysis of the 1987 Australian Election Study, attempts to elaborate these American findings about campaign specific media messages, voter uncertainty and time of voting decision.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH:

Traditionally, the time when voters make their decision about candidates has been an important independent variable in explaining news media effects in election campaigns.

The benchmark American presidential election studies of the 1940s identified two broad groups of voters: the precommitted, who made up their minds a long time before the election; and the last-minute deciders. Differences between the two groups in their levels of partisanship, attention to news media messages, political interest and discussions with others, were used to support a minimal effects position.

Precommitted voters were said to highly partisan and not easily swayed by campaign information. As Berelson et al. (1954:18) said, no real decisions were made by these voters during the campaign.

In contrast, the last-minute deciders were said not to be swayed by campaign information because of a lack of interest and motivation to participate in communication activities. This group of voters were said to be less politically interested, less attentive to the media and less likely to discuss the presidential election with family and friends.

In a re-examination of the traditional model, Chaffee and Choe (1980) argued that the dichotomy of precampaign versus late deciders needed revision because of changes in election campaigning and volatility of the electorate. Declining levels of partisanship, the rise of television news coverage of the campaign, and the pervasive nature of the news coverage, meant that the models of the 1940s and 1950s were now inappropriate. The role of partisanship in mediating the relationship between mass news media and vote choice needed examination, they argued, especially for those making up their minds during the campaign. They hypothesised that those voters who left their decision until the campaign should be more susceptible to news media influence.

The research found that precampaign decisions are made predominately by voters who are well educated, partisan and actively discussing the campaign before the period of heaviest coverage by the media. Last-minute deciders, on the other hand, were less interested and involved in the campaign and paid little attention to news about the campaign. These findings replicated previous research.

Strong evidence for campaign news media effects were detected for those voters who made up their minds during the election. "There is a substantial group of less partisan voters who, while not much interested prior to the campaign, pay close attention to the heavy flow of information during the campaign and vote on the basis of that information" (Chaffee and Choe, 1980: 67). The campaign specific-information included measures of the voters' ability to discriminate between candidates and issues.

In a separate research program, Becker and his colleagues (1984) have showed strong support for the link between vote choice and voter's knowledge of pro and con type arguments; that is, knowledge of positions for and against an issue, or knowledge of pro and con arguments in support of a candidate. Voter's gain this knowledge primarily from news media coverage during the campaign. These relationships appear to be stronger using campaign specific media use measures rather than general media use measures.

Becker and his colleagues (1982, 1983) examined also the relationship between knowledge of voting alternatives and

the uncertainty about those decisions. Uncertainty was measured in this research by asking voters if they had made up their minds about the election and, if so, how difficult it was to make that decision. The evidence, however, appears mixed.

Overall, the studies suggest that media use leads to knowledge, which, in turn, leads to uncertainty. Uncertainty is motivating, leading to an interest in subsequent information. The data suggest that knowledge produced uncertainty only for certain voters, "perhaps those with a basic interest in a decision or a belief in its importance" (Blood and Becker, 1984: 2).

Time of voting decision is not directly examined in this research program given the focus on the context of information in election campaigns. Conceptually, the time of decision is distinct from the certainty involving that decision.

We might expect, then, that for campaign deciders, knowledge of candidates and issues would reduce uncertainty about electoral choices. Following Becker, uncertainty is viewed as motivating such that those voters high in uncertainty should be expected to desire additional information about candidates and issues. In a 1984 study (Blood and Becker) this relationship was expected to hold only for those voters motivated to vote. That is, individuals not motivated to vote ought not experience uncertainty as a result of low levels of information. It was reasoned that uncertainty would be dampened by "opting-out" of the election process. This contingency model was not supported. Nevertheless, reasons why people are motivated to vote, or motivated to take an active role in an election campaign, are as varied as they are complex.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

The questions guiding this research are straightforward although they are understandably constrained by the nature of secondary analyses.

The studies mentioned above all used samples of American voters. Election contexts, of course, differ and may result in differing patterns of relationships. As Chaffee and Choe (1980: 67) note, in "landslide"

elections, where there is less campaign-specific news information, the dichotomy of precampaign and late campaign deciders may still be appropriate.

An Australian federal election provides a useful, if somewhat different, comparison. There have been frequent comments in the popular press in Australia (see, for example, *The Australian*, 1988) about the similarities between American and Australian elections, particularly in terms of the way television reports the campaign.

While the general perception is that there has been a decline in partisanship, recent analyses (Bean and Kelley, 1988) indicate considerable stability in the vote relative to other western democracies. And there are marked differences between American and Australian election campaigns.

First, and most importantly, Australian voters are deciding on which party will govern by winning a majority of seats under a preferential voting system in the House of Representatives. The vote does not decide who will be the country's prime minister. The leader of the party which wins a majority of seats becomes Prime Minister. The Australian campaign is also much shorter (usually five to six weeks) with no primary elections.

In contrast to the American system, minor parties can play a major (sometimes a deciding role) by allocation of preferences to the two major parties. Voters can, of course, depart from the minor party's how-to-vote card but minor parties have introduced some volatility into the election. In the upper house of parliament, the Senate, neither of the major parties holds a majority.

Unlike America, voting in Australia is compulsory with fines imposed on those who fail to vote. Turnout is around 95 per cent although enrolment is likely to be around 90 per cent. (Goot, 1985: 194).

With these differences in mind, this study first attempts to replicate the Chaffee and Choe (1980) finding concerning campaign deciders use of campaign specific information, and the use of this information in deciding on their vote choice. There is little guiding literature on time of voting decision and mass media use in an Australian federal election (See, for example, McAllister and Ascuí, 1988: 242).

Precampaign deciders are expected to be more partisan than campaign deciders, use campaign specific media information less than campaign deciders, and less likely to ascribe importance to the mass media in influencing their vote than campaign deciders.

In contrast, campaign deciders are expected to be less partisan, heavier users of campaign specific news information, and more likely to ascribe importance to the mass media in determining their vote than precampaign deciders.

This study will also examine the relationships between voters' knowledge of candidates and issues, vote choice, and voter uncertainty. Time of voting decision is expected to be related to the uncertainty measure used by Becker and his colleagues (1983).

For campaign deciders, media use should reduce uncertainty about electoral choices. Campaign media use should be related to knowledge of candidates and issues. For precampaign deciders, partisanship and interest in the campaign should be more important predictors of paying attention to campaign news. That is, time of voting decision should be an important control for the relationships suggested by the Becker et al. (1982) model.

RESEARCH DESIGN:

Data from the 1987 Australian Election Survey will be analysed (McAllister and Mughan, 1987). This cross-sectional survey is part of larger research program examining stability in political attitudes and behaviour.

A systematic random sample was drawn of all persons on the Australian electoral roll in June 1987 just before the election. 1,825 mail surveys were completed with a response rate of 63 per cent. Further information about the survey design can be found in McAllister and Mughan, 1987.

To assess use of campaign specific news information, respondents were asked how often they followed election news on each of television, newspapers and radio with the

response categories: often, sometimes, rarely and never. (Newspaper, Television, Radio Use).

The importance of these media to respondents was then measured by asking respondents whether they thought newspapers were very important, fairly important or not very important in shaping their vote decision. Similar questions were asked about television and radio. (Newspaper, Television, Radio Importance).

To measure the time of vote decision, the question asked of respondents was: "How long ago did you decide that you would definitely vote the way you did?" with the following response categories - a long time ago; sometime last year; sometime this year; during campaign.

Likelihood of vote change (Voter Uncertainty) was measured by asking respondents whether any time during the election campaign they seriously thought of voting for another party. Response categories were: no; yes, Liberal; yes, Labour; yes, National; yes, Democrats, yes, other party. This question is similar to the likelihood of change measure for candidates used by Becker. A measure of longer-term voting stability was measured by asking respondents whether they always voted for the same party or whether they had voted for different parties in other federal elections.

A list of issues were presented to respondents and they were asked to rate each as extremely important, quite important or not very important in deciding their vote. Issues included trade unions, unemployment, inflation, interest rates, health care, living standards, government spending, taxes, the rural crisis, the environment. (Issue Salience).

Partisanship was assessed by asking respondents first which to which party they were most attached. The question was followed by an intensity scale of very strong, fairly strong or not very strong support for the chosen party.

Interest in politics was operationalised on a 4-point scale as: "How much interest do you usually have in what's going on in politics?"

A zero through 10 scale from very unfavourable to very favourable was then used for a series of questions about

respondents perceptions of the political leaders of the major parties. These questions were followed by another series of statements where respondents were asked to choose the leader they best thought could achieve certain goals. These comprised: uniting the nation, getting things done, improving Australia's standing abroad, concern for all groups in society, getting the most out of a team, being in touch with ordinary people's problems, getting Australia out of its current economic problems. (Candidate Discrimination). A series of questions also asked respondents to rate the major parties in terms of moderate to extreme, divided to undivided, and good for one class or all classes. (Party Discrimination).

Respondents were also asked whether they cared who won the election or not. Much later in the questionnaire respondents were asked to indicate their feelings about voting: satisfaction; civic duty; risk a fine; annoyed; nothing in particular. This was followed by whether respondents thought the campaign was needed or whether they would be better off without a campaign. A five-point scale was used to measure respondents' attitudes toward compulsory voting.

Finally a series of social and personal background questions were asked including education.

ANALYSIS:

Table 1 shows the relationships between time of voting decision and the media use and importance measures, uncertainty (likelihood of vote change), and partisanship and political interest.

Campaign media use for television, newspapers and radio are shown. Media use is an additive combined measure. A similar procedure is used for media importance. A measure of Vote Importance was formed by adding respondents' scores on each of the four questions about whether respondents cared who won the election, whether the campaign was needed, attitudes toward compulsory voting, and feelings about voting. Partisanship, for this analysis, is the measure of strength of political attachment. Education comprises years of schooling plus years of tertiary or university education.

Predictably, voter uncertainty is positively related to time of voting decision. Voters who made up their minds late in the campaign are more uncertain about that decision. A similar relationship holds between the longer-term vote stability measure and time of voting decision.

In line with expectations, time of voting decision is also positively related to the media use importance measures. Recall that these measures asked respondents how important each of newspapers, television and radio were in their vote decision. Campaign deciders are more likely to report that these media were important in their decision than precampaign deciders.

Interestingly, the campaign specific media measures are negatively related to time of voting decision. That is, precampaign deciders appear to use the media heavily although they do not ascribe importance to it in their vote decision.

Partisanship (strength of political affiliation) and interest are also negatively related to time of voting decision. As expected, those voters who are strongly partisan and interested in politics are more likely to make early decisions about their vote. They are also more likely to attach importance to their vote choice.

To examine further these relationships, the sample was divided into two groups according to time of vote decision. For this analysis, respondents who reported making up their mind "a long time ago" and during the months before the election were classified as precampaign deciders. Campaign deciders formed the other group and comprise about 27 percent of the sample.

Unfortunately, late deciders cannot be identified. It is highly likely that the "campaign deciders" group will include these last-minute deciders, who may have very different campaign media-use patterns and levels of partisanship.

Table 2 shows the mean scores between these campaign and precampaign deciders of partisanship, interest, campaign media use, party discrimination, candidate discrimination, issue salience and media importance.

For each of the Party Discrimination questions identified earlier, respondents were scored as either "answer" or "no answer" and these added to form a summary measure of Party Discrimination. A similar procedure was used for the Candidate Discrimination questions. Issue Salience was formed by adding respondent's scores (extremely important, quite important, not at all important) on each of the issue questions.

Table 2 shows that precampaign decisions are made by those who are more partisan, more interested and attach more importance to their vote. Although the differences are generally small, these findings support Chaffee and Choe (1980). The differences in partisanship and vote importance are most noticeable.

There are small differences in levels of media use and these do not follow Chaffee and Choe (1980) analyses. Recall that the media use questions asked respondents how often they followed the campaign on each of television, newspapers and radio. It may well be that these less precise questions account for the small differences and the opposite trend to previous research.

In contrast, the importance respondent's attach to these media in reaching a vote decision show differences in the expected direction. Campaign deciders are more likely to attach importance to their media use in reaching a decision than precampaign deciders.

An examination of the knowledge measures across the two groups reveals no support for the hypothesised differences. This may be explained by the less precise measures of knowledge used in this study. Without a longitudinal or panel design it is difficult to account for media exposure before and during the campaign. The measures of party and candidate discrimination are relatively general and not directly tied to campaign specific matters. The same may be said of the issue salience measures which include broadly defined issue categories.

Overall, Table 1 and Table 2 offers some support for the Chaffee and Choe (1980) analysis despite the limited measures and differences in election contexts. It appears that partisanship and interest are stronger among the precampaign deciders than campaign deciders. But for campaign deciders, is the impact of partisanship and

interest influenced by voter uncertainty, as predicted by the research by Becker and his colleagues?

Table 3 shows the relationships between voter uncertainty and media use.

For the overall sample of voters, Table 3 provides no support for the idea that uncertainty motivates voters to seek additional information from the media. The same pattern of relationships holds for the longer-term vote stability indicator.

In contrast, uncertainty is positively related to the media importance measures. Those voters expressing more uncertainty are more likely to ascribe importance to the media in reaching their decision.

In line with the Chaffee and Choe (1980) and the Becker (1982) model, we should expect that uncertainty is negatively related to partisanship. Table 4 shows that this is indeed the case. Those voters who are more uncertain tend to be less partisan. The relationship between the longer-term vote stability measure and voter uncertainty is stronger. However, the same pattern of results do not hold for political interest, as Table 4 shows.

To explore further the Becker (1982) model, Table 5 shows the relationships between media use and the knowledge measures: party and candidate discrimination and issue salience.

All of the campaign specific media use measures are positively related to the knowledge measures.

As a point of comparison, the three media use measures are all highly inter-related (all greater than $r=.45$, $p<.05$) but only the party and candidate discrimination measures are related ($r=.20$, $p<.05$). It is not possible to make comparisons between general media use and campaign specific media use, following the Becker analyses.

Further, there are no relationships between formal education level and the campaign specific media use measures. The relationships between formal education and knowledge measures are slightly lower than the relationships between media and knowledge. For issue

salience, the negative relationship with formal education in part reflects the fact that partisanship is negatively related to education. Those voters with more formal education are less likely to be strong partisans, and partisanship is positively related to the campaign specific issue salience measure ($r=.16$, $p<.05$). Table 2 showed that campaign deciders had significantly more formal education.

Table 6 extends the analyses of the relationships between voter uncertainty, media use and knowledge by controlling for time of voting decision.

For precampaign deciders, the relationships between voter uncertainty and media use parallel Table 2. There is no evidence for any motivating influence of voter uncertainty despite the finding (in Table 2) that precampaign deciders are heavy media users. Table 6 suggests that precampaign deciders are attracted to the media by interest and education.

An important caveat is in order. The uncertainty measure in Table 6 is campaign specific; voters were asked to indicate whether during the campaign they had thought about switching their vote. The vote stability is not tied to the campaign context in this manner. The precampaign correlational data in Table 6 are at one level a pragmatic validity assessment of the simplistic uncertainty measure used here. We would not expect relationships between media use and uncertainty to emerge for this group because of the nature of the uncertainty measure.

The second group of correlations shown in Table 6 suggests that uncertainty does motivate voters who make their decisions during the campaign. These data support the initial stage of the Becker et al. (1982) model.

To extend examination of the Becker et al. (1982) model, Table 7 shows the relationships between the three knowledge measures and campaign specific media use by time of voting decision.

Table 6 shows very similar relationships between party discrimination and the media use measures across both campaign and precampaign deciders. Indeed, the relationships are similar to those reported in Table 5 where no control is introduced. For issue salience, the

relationship with media use is slightly stronger for campaign deciders than for precampaign deciders. For the candidate discrimination measure, the relationship with media use is weaker for campaign deciders than for precampaign deciders.

In summary, voter uncertainty appears to motivate **campaign deciders** to use the media and the data suggest that knowledge is related to media use. But Table 6 suggests that different factors account for the use of campaign specific media by **precampaign deciders**.

Following Chaffee and Choe (1980) the most plausible explanation would be that partisanship and interest motivate precampaign deciders to use campaign specific media. Overall, partisanship and interest are related ($r=.30$, $p<.05$). Table 8 shows the relationships between voter uncertainty and media use, controlling for levels of partisanship. For this analysis, the combined, additive measure of media use is only used to aid interpretation.

Table 8 shows strong relationships between media use and voter uncertainty for those voters who report weak political affiliations. In contrast, as expected, moderate and weak partisans show no evidence of the motivating role of uncertainty but strong relationships with political interest.

Table 9 extends these controls by examining the relationships between knowledge and media use.

Taken together, Tables 8 and 9 suggest the following. For weak partisans, those most likely to leave their decisions until later in the campaign, uncertainty motivates media use which increases knowledge of parties, candidates and issues. For moderate and strong partisans, those most likely to make early decisions, interest motivates media use. Admittedly, without a longitudinal design, the patterns of relationships and causal directions can only be suggestive but they are in agreement with the expectations of the Becker et al. research.

DISCUSSION:

Although limited by the constraints of secondary analysis, this study has demonstrated once again the importance of time of voting decision variable.

In the comparative framework examined in this study, time of voting decision is an important variable for delineating media effects on those voters who make up their minds during the campaign.

The data suggest that campaign deciders are more likely to attach importance to their media use in reaching a decision than precampaign deciders.

As expected, those voters who are strongly partisan and interested in politics are more likely to make early decisions about their vote. They are also more likely to attach importance to their vote choice.

Precampaign deciders appear to use the media heavily although they do not ascribe importance to it in their vote decision.

Preliminary evidence has also been presented which suggests a moderate expansion of the Becker et al. (1982) model, to include time of voting decision, is warranted. Although the voter uncertainty measure is much less precise than that used in previous research, the study suggests that both the time of voting decision, and the uncertainty surrounding that decision, should be included in any examination of media use and knowledge.

Voter uncertainty appears to motivate campaign deciders to use the media and the data suggest that knowledge is related to media use. These findings support the foundation of the Becker et al. (1982) model.

As an example of this expanded model, the data show that for weak partisans (those most likely to leave their decisions until later in the campaign) vote uncertainty motivates media use which increases knowledge of parties, candidates and issues. But for moderate and strong partisans (those most likely to make early decisions about their vote choice), interest motivates media use.

Given the constraints of the data, it has not been possible to explore these suggested relationships with the non-traditional knowledge measures used by Becker and his colleagues.

Table 1.

Pearson's Correlations Between Media Use,
Media Importance, Uncertainty, Partisanship,
Political Interest and Time of Voting Decision.

Time of Voting Decision.

Media Use:

Newspaper	-.12 *
Television	-.12 *
Radio	-.08*
Combined Media	-.11*

Media Importance To Vote:

Newspaper Importance	.11
Television Importance	.17
Radio Importance	.11
Combined Media Importance	.17
Partisanship	.34
Political Interest	.14
Vote Importance	.14
Voter Uncertainty	-.40
Vote Stability	-.33

N's vary from 1520 to 1825.

* $p < .05$, one-tailed test.

Table 2.

Partisanship, Political Interest, Campaign Media Use
and Importance, Candidate and Party Discrimination
and Issue Salience by Time of Voting Decision.

	Precampaign Deciders	Campaign Deciders
Partisanship	2.0	1.6 *
Political Interest	2.4	2.1 *
Vote Importance	11.0	10.2 *
Television Use	3.4	3.2 *
Newspaper Use	2.9	2.7 *
Radio Use	2.7	2.5 *
Media Use	8.8	8.3 *
Television Importance	1.6	1.9 *
Newspaper Importance	1.5	1.7 *
Radio Importance	1.4	1.5
Media Importance	4.4	5.0 *
Party Discrimination	5.5	5.3 *
Candidate Discrimination	5.8	5.3 *
Issue Salience	24.0	23.1 *
Education	16.0	16.9 *

Table entries are means for each of the listed measures.

* significant difference; t-test (one-tailed) $p < .05$

N's vary from 384 to 484 for campaign deciders and from 983 to 1306 for precampaign deciders.

Table 3.

Pearson's Correlations Between Voter Uncertainty
and Media Use, and Media Importance

Campaign Media Use:				
	Newspaper	Television	Radio	Combined Media
Voter Uncertainty	.01	.03	.07	.05
Vote Stability	.01	-.02	.08*	.04

Campaign Media Importance:				
	Newspaper	Television	Radio	Combined Media
Voter Uncertainty	.13*	.11*	.14*	.17*
Vote Stability	.03	.02	.08*	.07

* $p < .05$, one-tailed test.

N's vary from 1520 to 1825.

Table 4.

Pearson's Correlations Between Voter Uncertainty and
Partisanship and Political Interest.

	Partisanship	Political Interest
Voter Uncertainty	-.18*	-.02
Vote Stability	-.24*	-.03

* $p < .05$, one-tailed test.

N's range from 1771 to 1810.

Table 5.

**Pearson's Correlations Between Knowledge
and Media Use.**

	N'paper	TV	Radio	Media	Education
Party Discrimination	.19*	.17*	.14*	.21*	.13*
Candidate Discrimination	.10*	.16*	.10*	.16*	.09*
Issue Salience	.13*	.18*	.15*	.18*	-.19*

* $p < .05$, one-tailed test.

N's range from 1375 to 1825.

Table 6.

**Pearson's Correlations Between Uncertainty
and Media Use By Time of Voting Decision.**

	Precampaign Deciders			
	Newspaper	Television	Radio	Media
Voter Uncertainty	.01	.02	.10*	.06
Vote Stability	.00	-.02	.08	.03

	Campaign Deciders			
	Newspaper	Television	Radio	Media
Voter Uncertainty	.13*	.16*	.14*	.19*
Vote Stability	.12	.06	.17*	.16*

* $p < .05$, one-tailed test.

N's range from 983 to 1316 for precampaign deciders and from 384 to 484 for campaign deciders.

Table 7.

Pearson's Correlations Between Knowledge and Media
Use by Time of Voting Decision.

	Precampaign Deciders			
	N'paper	Television	Radio	Media
Party				
Discrimination	.19*	.15*	.14*	.20*
Candidate				
Discrimination	.10*	.14*	.10*	.16*
Issue Salience	.11*	.14*	.13*	.14*
	Campaign Deciders			
	N'paper	Television	Radio	Media
Party				
Discrimination	.19*	.20*	.12*	.21*
Candidate				
Discrimination	.06	.16*	.08	.11
Issue Salience	.13*	.24*	.18*	.22*

* $p < .05$, one-tailed test.

N's range from 983 to 1316 for precampaign deciders and
from 384 to 484 for campaign deciders.

Table 8.

Pearson's Correlations Between Media Use
and Uncertainty, Controlling for Partisanship.

	Weak Partisans	Moderate Partisans	Strong Partisans
	Media Use	Media Use	Media Use
Voter Uncertainty	.17*	.08	.09
Political Interest	.04	.37*	.21*

* $p < .05$, one-tailed test.

N's range from 494 to 579 for weak partisanship, 687 to 836 for moderate partisanship, and 241 to 352 for strong partisanship.

Table 9

Pearson's Correlations Between Knowledge
and Media Use, Controlling for Partisanship.

	Weak Partisans	Moderate Partisans	Strong Partisans
	Media Use	Media Use	Media Use
Party Discrimination	.22*	.13*	.16
Candidate Discrimination	.16*	.09	.11
Issue Discrimination	.14*	.09	.21*

* $p < .05$, one-tailed test.

N's range from 494 to 579 for weak partisanship, 687 to 836 for moderate partisanship, and 241 to 352 for strong partisanship.

REFERENCES:

- Bean, C. & Kelley, J. (1988)
 Partisan Stability and Short-term Change in the 1987
 Federal Election: Evidence from the NSSS Panel
 Survey. *Politics* 23 (2): 80-94.
- Becker, L., Blood, R. & Greenwald, M. (1984)
 Media Use and the Learning of Political Arguments.
 Paper presented to the Political Communication
 Division of the International Communication
 Association, Annual Conference, San Fransisco.
- Becker, L. & Blood, R. (1983)
 Media Use and Voter Uncertainty. Paper presented to
 the Theory and Methodology Division of the
 Association for Education in Journalism and Mass
 Communication, Annual Convention, Corvallis,
 Oregon.
- Becker, L. & Demers, D. (1982)
 Motivations, Media Use and Electoral Decision-
 Making. Paper presented to the Theory and
 Methodology Division of the Association for
 Education in Journalism and Mass Communication,
 Annual Convention, Athens, Ohio.
- Berelson, B., Lazarsfeld, P. & McPhee, J. (1954)
Voting. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Blood, R. & Becker, L. (1983)
 Electoral Knowledge and Uncertainty. Paper
 presented to the Theory and Methodology Division of
 the Association in Journalism and Education, Annual
 Convention, Gainesville, Florida.
- Chaffee, S. & Choe, S. (1980)
 Time of Decision and Media Use During the Ford-
 Carter Campaign, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 44 (1):
 53-69.
- Goot, M. (1985)
 Electoral Systems. In Aitkin, D. (ed.) *Surveys of
 Australian Political Science*. Sydney: George Allen &
 Unwin.

- Lazarsfeld, P., Berelson, B. & Gaudet, H. (1944)
 The People's Choice. New York: Columbia University Press.
- McAllister, I. & Ascui, A. (1988)
 Voting Patterns. In McAllister, I. & Warhurst, J. (eds.) **Australia Votes.** Sydney: Longman Cheshire.
- McAllister, I & Mughan, A. (1987)
 Australian Election Survey 1987. (Machine-readable data file). Data collected by Ascui, A. Canberra: Jones, R. (Producer) Social Science Data Archives, The Australian National University. (SSDA Study No. 445).